

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Timothy Randolph Fletcher, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
Facebook, Inc., Meta Platforms, Inc., )  
Numerous Unknown Facebook )  
Employees, Numerous Unknown Meta )  
Platform Employees, Numerous )  
Unknown US Government Employees, )  
Numerous Unknown Non-Governmental )  
Organizations, and Numerous Unknown )  
Co-Conspirators, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-1384-BHH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Timothy Randolph Fletcher's pro se ("Plaintiff") amended complaint alleging various civil rights violations. (ECF No. 17.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On February 13, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report"), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court grant Plaintiff's motion to transfer and transfer this case to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California for further proceedings. (ECF No. 38.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, no objections to the Report have been filed, and the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. **Accordingly, the Court adopts and specifically incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 38), and the Court grants Plaintiff’s motion to transfer (ECF No. 33) and transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

March 5, 2025  
Charleston, South Carolina